

REMARKS

Examination of the present application is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication on pages 1 and 6 of the Office Action that claims 23-27 are allowed.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 8-9, 13-17, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,330,045 to Hodlewsky.

With regards to the rejections based on Hodlewsky, Applicant incorporates by reference his previous statements, including the Attachment to the Pre-Appeal Brief filed April 30, 2008. Hodlewsky does not disclose lobes.

Applicant has amended claims 8 and 20 to include that the lobes are at least partly non-circular. Since it is commonly accepted that lobes are at least partly non-circular, this amendment does not narrow the breadth of these claims. However, these amendments do address the statements of the Office Action on page 7 in the second paragraph of section 10.

With regards to statements in the Office Action in the second paragraph of page 8, Hodlewsky defines his rollers 48 to be rotatable relative to their supporting shaft (column 4, lines 15-18). Therefore, the chains 52 do not interlock adjacent rollers. Chains 52 simply interlock roller shafts.

Based on the above statements and the amendments to claims 8 and 20, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of these claims, and allowance of claims 8 and 20 and all claims dependent thereon.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hodlewsky in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0146065 to Plesh.

Claims 10-11 each depend upon claim 8, and include all elements of claim 8. Therefore, these claims are allowable at least by being dependent upon an allowable independent claim. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hodlewsky in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,270,899 to Faulkner.

Claim 12 depends upon claim 8, and includes all elements of claim 8. Therefore, this claim is allowable at least by being dependent upon an allowable independent claim. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hodlewsky in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,148,991 to Meishner.

Claims 18 and 19 each depend upon claim 8, and include all elements of claim 8. Therefore, these claims are allowable at least by being dependent upon an allowable independent claim. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections.

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hodlewsky in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,062,378 to Clopton.

Claim 22 depends upon claim 20, and includes all elements of claim 20. Therefore, this claim is allowable at least by being dependent upon an allowable independent claim. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

New dependent claims.

Applicant has added dependent claims 40 - 55. Each of these dependent claims depend upon an allowable independent claim (either 20 or 23). Applicant respectfully requests entry and allowance of these dependent claims.

CLOSING

Applicant has amended claims 8 and 20, added new dependent claims 40-55, and canceled claims 1 – 7 and 28 - 39. Applicant respectfully requests examination of pending claims 8 – 27 and 40 – 55.

The undersigned welcomes a telephonic interview with the Examiner, if the Examiner believes that such an interview would facilitate examination of this application.

It should be understood that the above remarks are not intended to provide an exhaustive basis for patentability or concede any basis for rejections or objections in the Office Action. For those rejections based upon a combination of references, there is no admission that the cited combinations are legally permitted, properly motivated, or operable. Further, with regards to the various statements made in the Office Action concerning any prior art, the teachings of any prior art are to be interpreted under the law. Applicants make no admissions as to any prior art. The remarks herein are provided simply to overcome the rejections and objections made in the Office Action in an expedient fashion.

Respectfully submitted,

By /John V. Daniluck/
John V. Daniluck
Reg. No. 40,581
Bingham McHale, LLP
10 West Market Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
(317) 968-5531 telephone
(317) 236-9907 facsimile